

A בס"ד

Intro

Today we will Be"H learn of דף ס"א of סנהדרין. Some of the topics we will learn about include:

עבודת כוכבים

Many aspects of idol-worship, including:

כדרכה ושלא כדרכה

Serving an idol in its customary manner or in a different way, whether respectful or disrespectful;

מסית לעצמו

If someone persuades others to worship him; and

העובד מאהבה ומיראה

One who worships an idol out of fear of, or love for, another person, but did not actually accept the idol as a deity in his heart.

A

עבודת כוכבים

כדרכה ושלא כדרכה

מסית לעצמו

העובד מאהבה ומיראה

B

האומר אעבוד

Whether one is liable for merely saying, "I will worship an idol," but he did not actually worship it yet?

The Gemara discusses several factors:

באומר איני מקבלו עלי אלא בעבודה

If one explicitly declared, "I am not accepting the idol as a deity until I worship it;"

יחיד הניסת

או רבים הניסתי

Whether discussing an individual or a group of people;

ניסת מפי עצמו

או ניסת מפי אחרים

Whether discussing an individual who convinced himself to serve זרה עבודה or he was incited by others; and

ישראל מומר

Whether discussing an ordinary Jew or an apostate.

B

האומר אעבוד

באומר איני מקבלו עלי אלא בעבודה

יחיד הניסת או רבים הניסתי

ניסת מפי עצמו או ניסת מפי אחרים

ישראל מומר

1

So let's review...

The Gemara earlier explained
יצאה השתחוואה לידון בעצמה

יצאה זביחה לידון על הכלל כולו

The Torah issues a general prohibition against serving idols in their customary manner. Yet the Pasuk explicitly mentions slaughtering separately, to establish the principle of

עבודת פנים

One is liable for performing for an idol any service that was done in the המקדש בית, even if it is not the customary way to worship this idol.

The Pasuk also explicitly mentions bowing separately, and so one is also liable for bowing to an idol, even though it is not a service in the המקדש בית, even if it is not the customary way to serve this idol.

The Gemara there suggested an alternate interpretation:

יצאה השתחוואה ללמד על הכלל כולו

Perhaps we use bowing as a general principle, and one is liable for any respectful form of service? And the Gemara refuted this version.

1

וּבַח לְאֱלֹהִים יִזְרַם

and later says

וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ לָהֶם אֲזָרִים

... וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ לָהֶם ...

יצאה זביחה

לידון

על הכלל כולו

יצאה השתחוואה

לידון

בעצמה

The Torah issues a general prohibition against serving idols in their customary manner.

Yet the Pasuk mentions slaughtering separately, to establish the principle of

עבודת פנים

One is liable for performing for an idol any service that was done in the המקדש בית, even if it is not the customary way to worship this idol.

The Pasuk also explicitly mentions bowing separately, and so one is also liable for bowing to an idol, even though it is not a service in the המקדש בית, even if it is not the customary way to serve this idol.

The Gemara suggested an alternate interpretation:

יצאה השתחוואה

ללמד על הכלל כולו

Perhaps we use bowing as a general principle, and one is liable for any respectful form of service?

And the Gemara refuted this version.

2 The Gemara now questions the entire premise:
If we were to say
יצאה השתחואה ללמד על הכלל כולו

איכה יעבדו
למעוטי מאי

Why would we need a separate Pasuk to teach us that one is liable for serving an idol in its customary fashion, if there is a general principle derived from bowing that one is liable for any respectful service?

At first, the Gemara answers
למעוטי הפוער עצמו לזובחים

The Pasuk would serve to exclude someone who relieves himself, in the way they would worshiped the idol פוער, before an idol for which it's customary to slaughter sacrifices.

However, the Gemara argues

מהשתחואה נפקא
מה השתחואה דרך כיבוד
אף כל דרך כיבוד

This is already excluded by the principle derived from bowing, which only included respectful forms of worship.

Therefore, the Gemara answers

למעוטי הפוער עצמו למרקוליס

The Pasuk would serve to exclude someone who relieves himself in front of the idol מרקוליס, which is customarily worshipped by throwing stones at it;

And we might argue

הואיל ועבודתו בזיון הוא
אף כל בזיון

Since it is worshiped in a non-respectful manner, perhaps one is liable for any non-respectful form of worship; Therefore, this Pasuk would teach us that one is only liable for worshipping an idol in a different, respectful manner.

2



*The Gemara now questions the entire premise:
If we were to say*

יצאה השתחואה ללמד על הכלל כולו

**איכה יעבדו הגוים האלה
את אלהיהם**

למעוטי מאי

Why would we need a separate Pasuk to teach us that one is liable for serving an idol in its customary fashion, if there is a general principle derived from bowing that one is liable for any respectful service?

**למעוטי הפוער עצמו
לזובחים**

The Pasuk serves to exclude someone who relieves himself, in the way they would worshiped the idol פוער, before an idol for which it's customary to slaughter sacrifices.



However, the Gemara argues

**מהשתחואה נפקא
מה השתחואה דרך כיבוד
אף כל דרך כיבוד**

This is already excluded by the principle derived from bowing, which only included respectful forms of worship.

Therefore, the Gemara answers

**למעוטי הפוער עצמו
למרקוליס**

The Pasuk would serve to exclude someone who relieves himself in front of the idol מרקוליס, which is customarily worshipped by throwing stones at it;

And we might argue

**הואיל ועבודתו בזיון הוא
אף כל בזיון**

Since it is worshiped in a non-respectful manner, perhaps one is liable for any non-respectful form of worship;

Therefore, this Pasuk would teach us that one is only liable for worshipping an idol in a different, respectful manner.

3 The Gemara now challenges the refuted premise from a ברייתא:
 זובח בהמה למרקוליס חייב
 One who slaughters an animal to מרקוליס, an idol usually worshipped by throwing stones at it, is liable, as the Pasuk says
 ולא יזבחו עוד את זבוחיהם לשעירים
 An additional prohibition not to slaughter to idols, and
 אם אינו ענין לכדרכה
 דכתיב איכה יעבדו
 תניהו ענין לשלא כדרכה
 Since we already know that one is liable for worshipping an idol in its customary manner, this Pasuk refers to slaughtering an animal to an idol not usually worshipped in this way.

The Gemara asks
 מהשתחואה נפקא
 According to our premise that the example of bowing establishes a general principle, this would include slaughtering, a respectful form of worship?

The Gemara answers
 התם בזובח להכעיס
 This Pasuk would refer to slaughtering to the idol, in order to anger Hashem, without truly accepting it as a deity.
 Nevertheless, it is forbidden.
 =====

3

?

ברייתא

זובח בהמה למרקוליס חייב
One who slaughters an animal to מרקוליס, an idol usually worshipped by throwing stones at it, is liable, as the Pasuk says

ולא יזבחו עוד את זבוחיהם לשעירים
An additional prohibition not to slaughter to idols, and

אם אינו ענין לכדרכה
דכתיב איכה יעבדו
תניהו ענין לשלא כדרכה
Since we already know that one is liable for worshipping an idol in its customary manner, this Pasuk refers to slaughtering an animal to an idol not usually worshipped in this way.

The Gemara asks

מהשתחואה נפקא
According to our premise that the example of bowing establishes a general principle, this would include slaughtering, a respectful form of worship?

▼

The Gemara answers

התם בזובח להכעיס
This Pasuk would refer to slaughtering to the idol, just to anger Hashem, without truly accepting it as a deity.
Nevertheless, it is forbidden.

4 The Gemara continues to elaborate on the Mishnah on דף ס'
העובד עבודת כוכבים
One who worships idols is liable. Which infers,
עובד אין
אומר לא
One is not liable for merely stating his intent to worship idols.

The Gemara challenges this inference from a Mishnah on דף ס"ז:

האומר אעבוד
אלך ואעבוד
נלך ונעבוד

If one is incited to worship idols, he is liable as soon as he says, "I will worship an idol," or "I will go and worship," or "Let us go and worship."

The Gemara cites several answers:

1.

באומר איני מקבלו עלי אלא בעבודה

Everyone agrees that one is liable for merely saying he will worship the idol, thereby accepting the idol as a deity. However, our Mishnah is discussing where he explicitly declared, "I am not accepting the idol as a deity until I worship it."

Therefore, he is only liable once he worships it.

4

העובד עבודת כוכבים
One who worships idols is liable.
Which infers,
עובד אין – אומר לא
One is not liable
for merely stating his intent to worship idols.

**האומר אעבוד
אלך ואעבוד
נלך ונעבוד**
If one is incited to worship idols, he is liable as soon as he says, "I will worship an idol," or "I will go and worship," or "Let us go and worship."

1
**באומר איני מקבלו עלי
אלא בעבודה**
Everyone agrees that one is liable for merely saying he will worship the idol, thereby accepting the idol as a deity.
However, our Mishnah is discussing where he declared: "I am not accepting the idol as a deity until I worship it." Therefore, he is only liable once he worships it.

5

2.

An alternate answer:

This is indeed a מחלוקת תנאים, as we find in the following ברייתא:

האומר בואו ועבדוני

If someone says, "Come and worship me;"

רבי מאיר מחייב

ורבי יהודה פוטר

רבי מאיר says he is liable as a מסית, one who incites to עבודה זרה, but רבי יהודה says he is exempt.

Now,

היכא דפלחו כו"ע

לא פליגי

Everyone agrees that if they worship him he is liable, as the Pasuk says

לא תעשה לך פסל

Do not make yourself into an idol.

However, they disagree

בדיבורא בעלמא

If he merely incited them, but they did not listen.

רבי מאיר סבר

דיבורא מילתא היא

רבי יהודה סבר

דיבורא לאו מילתא היא

רבי יהודה holds he is liable for mere speech, while רבי מאיר

holds he is not liable for mere speech. Similarly, they

would disagree regarding stating one's intention to serve an idol.

5

2

This is indeed a מחלוקת תנאים,

ברייתא

האומר בואו ועבדוני

If someone says, "Come and worship me;"

רבי יפוצק

פוטר

רבי מאיר

מחייב

he is liable as a מסית, one who incites to עבודה זרה

Now,

היכא דפלחו כו"ע לא פליגי

Everyone agrees that if they worship him he is liable,

as the Pasuk says

לא תעשה לך פסל

Do not make yourself into an idol.

However, they disagree

בדיבורא בעלמא

If he merely incited them, but they did not listen.

רבי יפוצק סבר

דיבורא

לאו מילתא היא

he is not liable for mere speech.

רבי מאיר סבר

דיבורא

מילתא היא

he is liable for mere speech,

Similarly, they would disagree regarding stating one's intention to serve an idol.

6 However, the Gemara retracts this answer:
 אפילו לרבי יהודה
 בדיבורא נמי חיובי מחייב
 רבי יהודה also agrees that one can be liable for mere speech,
 as he rules in another ברייתא:
 רבי יהודה אומר
 לעולם אינו חייב
 עד שיאמר אעבוד
 אלך ואעבוד
 נלך ונעבוד
 He is liable if he says, "I will worship an idol," or "I will go
 and worship," or "Let us go and worship," but not if he
 incites others to worship him.

Therefore, the מחלוקת pertains specifically
 במסית לעצמו
 ואמרי ליה אין
 קמפלגי
 When he incites others to worship him, and they agree.
 רבי מאיר holds
 שמעי ליה
 ואין דקאמרי ליה קושטא הוא
 They will listen to him, and they were sincere in their
 agreement.
 Therefore, he is liable as a מסית.
 רבי יהודה holds
 לא שמעי ליה
 מימר אמרי
 מ"ש איהו מינן דידן
 ואין דקאמרי אחוכי עליה
 They will not listen to him, because they will reason, "He
 is not different than any of us," and they only agreed in
 order to ridicule him.
 Therefore, he is not liable as a מסית.

6 
אפילו לרבי יהודה
בדיבורא נמי חיובי מחייב
 רבי יהודה also agrees that one can be liable for mere speech,
 as he rules in another ברייתא:

רבי יבוצק אומר
לעולם אינו חייב
עד שיאמר אעבוד
אלך ואעבוד – נלך ונעבוד
 He is liable if he says, "I will worship an idol," or
 "I will go and worship," or "Let us go and worship,
 but not if he incites others to worship him.

Therefore, the מחלוקת pertains specifically
במסית לעצמו ואמרי ליה אין
קמפלגי
 When he incites others to worship him, and they agree.

רבי יבוצק
לא שמעי ליה
מימר אמרי
מ"ש איהו מינן דידן
ואין דקאמרי
אחוכי עליה
They will not listen to him,
because they will reason,
"He is not different than us,"
and they only agreed
in order to ridicule him.
 Therefore,
 he is not liable as a מסית.

רבי מאיר
שמעי ליה
ואין דקאמרי
ליה קושטא הוא
They will listen to him,
and they were sincere in
their agreement.
 Therefore,
 he is liable as a מסית.

7

3.

A third resolution to the contradiction:

כאן ביחיד הניסת

כאן ברבים הניסתים

An individual is liable for expressing his intention to worship an idol, while a group of people are only liable once they actually worship, and the Gemara explains יחיד לא מימלך וטעי בתריה

רבים מימלכי ולא טעו בתריה

An individual will maintain his error, and will actually stray after the idol, while a group of people will recognize their error and will not stray, and so they are not liable for merely agreeing to worship.

בריינתא אביי challenges this distinction from a תרייתא:

כי יסיתך אחיך בן אמך

אחד יחיד הניסת ואחד רבים הניסתים

There's no difference between someone who incites an individual OR a group to עבודה זרה.

7

3

כאן ביחיד הניסת כאן ברבים הניסתים

An individual is liable for expressing his intention to worship an idol, while a group of people are only liable once they actually worship.

And the Gemara explains

יחיד לא מימלך וטעי בתריה
רבים מימלכי ולא טעו בתריה

An individual will maintain his error, and will actually stray after the idol, while a group of people will recognize their error and will not stray, and so they are not liable for merely agreeing to worship.

?

בריינתא אביי challenges this from a תרייתא:

כי יסיתך אחיך בן אמך
אחד יחיד הניסת ואחד רבים
הניסתים

There's no difference between someone who incites an individual OR a group to עבודה זרה.

8

4. Another resolution:
 כאן בניסת מפי עצמו
 כאן בניסת מפי אחרים
 One who convinces himself to serve עבודה זרה is only liable if he actually worships it, while one who is incited by others is liable for agreeing, and the Gemara explains מעצמו מימלך מפי אחרים גריר בתרייהו
 An individual might reconsider, but when incited by others he will usually be drawn after them.

5. הא דא"ל כן אוכלת כן שותה כן מטייה כן מריעה
 'הא דלא א"ל כן אוכלת כן שותה כן'
 If he was incited, and was told, "These are the praiseworthy practices of the idol," he will be drawn after it, and is liable for agreeing, but if he was not told of its praises, he will reconsider and is not liable for merely agreeing.

6. סיפא בישראל מומר
 An ordinary Jew is only liable if he actually serves the idol, but an apostate is liable for declaring his intent to serve, since he will not retract.

7. לא זו אף זו קתני
 מחלוקת: The first Mishnah taught that one is liable for serving, and the second Mishnah added that one is even liable for declaring his intent to serve.
 =====

8

4

כאן בניסת מפי עצמו כאן בניסת מפי אחרים

עבודה זרה One who convinces himself to serve is only liable if he actually worships it, while one who is incited by others is liable for agreeing.

And the Gemara explains

מעצמו מימלך

מפי אחרים גריר בתרייהו

An individual might reconsider, but when incited by others he will usually be drawn after them.

5

הא דא"ל כן אוכלת כן שותה כן מטייה כן מריעה הא דלא א"ל כן אוכלת כן שותה כן'

If he was incited, and was told, "These are the praiseworthy practices of the idol," he will be drawn after it, and is liable for agreeing, but if he was not told of its praises, he will reconsider and is not liable for merely agreeing.

6

סיפא בישראל מומר

An ordinary Jew is only liable if he actually serves the idol.

But an apostate is liable for declaring his intent to serve, since he will not retract.

7

לא זו אף זו קתני

מחלוקת:

The first Mishnah taught that one is liable for serving, and the second Mishnah added that one is even liable for declaring his intent to serve.



9 The Gemara introduces another aspect of idol-worship:

העובד עבודת כוכבים
מאהבה ומיראה

One who worships an idol out of love for, or fear of,
another person, but did not actually accept the idol as a
deity in his heart;

אביי אמר

חייב

דהא פלחה

He is liable, because he served the idol;

רבא אמר

פטור

אי קבליה עליה באלוה אין

אי לא לא

He is not liable, because he did not accept it as a deity.

9

העובד עבודת כוכבים מאהבה ומיראה

One who worships an idol
out of love for, or fear of, another person,
but did not actually accept the idol as a deity in his heart;

רבא אמר

פטור

אי קבליה עליה
באלוה אין
אי לא לא

He is not liable, because
he did not accept it as a deity.

אביי אמר

חייב

דהא פלחה

He is liable,
because he served the idol;